

10 San Francisco, California
Monday, February 3, 2014

12 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE OFFICIAL ELECTRONIC SOUND
RECORDING

APPEARANCES.

For Plaintiff:

Glancy, Binkow & Goldberg, LLP
One Embarcadero Center
Suite 760
San Francisco, California
94111

BY: LEE ALBERT, ESQ.

19 Hausfeld, LLP
44 Montgomery Street
Suite 3400
20 San Francisco, California
94104
21 BY: MICHAEL HAUSFELD, ESQ.
CHRISTOPHER L. LEBSOCK, ESQ.

Transcribed by:

Echo Reporting, Inc.
Contracted Court Reporter/
Transcriber
echoreporting@yahoo.com

25 (APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

1 APPEARANCES: (CONTINUED)

2 For Plaintiff:

3 Gold, Bennett, Cera & Sidener
4 595 Market Street
5 Suite 2300
6 San Francisco, California
7 94105
8 (415) 777-2230

9 BY: SOLOMON B. CERA, ESQ.

10 Lowey, Dannenberg, Cohen &
11 Hart, PC

12 One North Broadway
13 Suite 509
14 White Plains, New York 10601
15 BY: BARBARA J. HART, ESQ.
16 SUNG-MIN LEE, ESQ.

17 Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy
18 LLP

19 840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200
20 Burlingame, California 94010
21 BY: STEVEN NOEL WILLIAMS, ESQ.

22 Freed, Kanner, London &
23 Millen, LLC

24 2201 Waukegan Road, Suite 130
25 Bannockburn, Illinois
60015

(224) 632-4500

BY: STEVEN A. KANNER, ESQ.

26 Saveri & Saveri, Inc.

27 706 Sansome Street
28 San Francisco, California
29 94111

30 BY: RICHARD ALEXANDER SAVERI, ESQ.

31 For Defendants:

32 Gibson Dunn
33 555 Mission Street
34 Suite 3000

35 San Francisco, California
36 94105

37 (415) 393-8268

38 BY: JOEL SANDERS, ESQ.

1 Monday, February 3, 2014

9:03 a.m.

2 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

3 --oo--

4 THE CLERK: Calling civil matter 13-4148, Pitco
5 Foods versus Nong Shim Company, Ltd and associated cases.

6 THE COURT: So welcome everybody. Let me tell you
7 what I've gleaned from the papers, and then we'll go --
8 we'll let everybody make a little pitch.

9 First thing is, I'm not going to be able to
10 differentiate between the firms on the basis of the quality
11 of representation. So I don't need to hear you tell me how
12 terrific your firms are, how many cases you've handled
13 because you're all great lawyers from great firms. That's
14 not an issue for me.

15 The second thing is that nobody really talked about how
16 thorough you'd be at keeping your costs down and not doing
17 duplicative work and providing at the end of the day
18 complete records for your fee request without block billing.
19 All those things are important. I'm just saying them at the
20 outset of the case so that there aren't any surprises at the
21 end.

22 So with respect to the firms, this is what I've seen
23 from the papers. One is that Hausfeld and Glancy, Binkow &
24 Goldberg filed the first case two months before the others.
25 They've done a motion for class cert, obtained an expert

1 report, done multiple motions to dismiss, procured the
2 Korean fair trade opinion. They've put in 115,000 bucks and
3 some costs. They've got a Korean firm associated with them.

4 Lowey, Dannenberg and Gold, Bennett have five cases
5 that they represent. They've done a database of probative
6 evidence, done an analysis of pricing information and
7 e-mails, retained an economic expert and worked with the
8 parties, put the stip together.

9 And then Freed Kanner and Saveri have three cases, \$5
10 million in products, have experience with the Asian Food
11 Trade Association, litigation experience in Asia.

12 So what I'm interested in hearing from everybody is why
13 these facts or any others really matter in the determination
14 that I need to make, which I intend to make today. So --
15 but not in this hearing.

16 So why don't we start with the folks who filed the
17 first case, Hausfeld.

18 MR. ALBERT: Good morning, your Honor. My name is
19 Lee Albert from Glancy, Binkow & Goldberg.

20 As you said, we filed the first case in July of 2013.
21 I've been working with the Hausfeld firm on this case,
22 however, for approximately a year. We began investigating
23 the case on behalf of my client about February of 2013, and
24 subsequent to the investigation, we went on to translate and
25 analyze the KFTC opinion. And subsequent to that, after we

1 filed suit, we then actually litigated the case.

2 And Hausfeld and Glancy, Binkow have been efficiency,
3 the two firms together, litigating this case essentially
4 since July of 2013. I've been working with the Hausfeld
5 firm, and I'd like to ask Mr. Hausfeld to speak for our
6 group's petition to avoid inefficiency of just duplication
7 of me talking. Okay.

8 MR. HAUSFELD: Good morning, your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Good morning.

10 MR. HAUSFELD: I'm Michael Hausfeld.

11 The trend in appointments of counsel on behalf of
12 Plaintiff's organization has moved in a different direction
13 more recently. It used to be that there were four co-lead
14 counsels, sometimes executive committees of 10 or 12. And
15 the courts have taken a more acute view of that number of
16 attorneys representing Plaintiffs in a class, particularly
17 in the anti-trust field.

18 And in this jurisdiction in particular, courts have
19 moved to approving or focusing on appointing one to two co-
20 lead counsel, particularly in the context of the litigation
21 itself, depending upon how large the litigation is. And
22 this matter, from our perspective, seems to be relatively
23 modest.

24 So we proposed a two co-lead organizational structure,
25 even to the point of at one time, given all of the counsel

1 involved, if we could agree on two co-lead from among those,
2 that would seem to make sense. But given the
3 practicalities, the litigation didn't seem to warrant more
4 than that in terms of the leadership structure itself.

5 We have extensive contacts in South Korea. We have
6 affiliate offices in South Korea. We represent a number of
7 South Korean large corporate clients in other matters, not
8 only in the U.S., but outside the U.S. And this is a case
9 that's going to involve extensive discovery and
10 understanding of the business operations in South Korea.

11 We have affiliated with two South Korean firms, one of
12 which, the Drescher firm, actually represented the KFTC in
13 defending the KFTC's decision with regard to the claims of
14 price fixing in this litigation.

15 We were the first firm that held an anti-trust forum
16 with the KFTC three years ago, and we have extensive contact
17 with the senior personnel there in terms of their approach
18 to private enforcement in the anti-trust field in Korea.

19 This case, no matter what, is going to involve
20 extensive understanding of Korean business, Korean business
21 practices, Korean documents. And given the association of
22 those firms with us, we feel we have an ability to cut
23 through a large part of that with firms that already know
24 the basic elements of the offense and where we should be
25 concentrating our efforts in prosecuting or extending that

1 violation to the United States market.

2 Recently, we were selected by a federal judge in
3 Birmingham, Alabama, because of the two people in our firm
4 that have probably the most extensive experience among
5 practitioners generally, not just plaintiffs, but
6 defendants, in e-discovery. And we were -- part of that
7 selection was based on that knowledge and being able to
8 formulate the protocols necessary to examine the documents,
9 to examine them efficiently and have a protocol that would
10 be available for both the Plaintiffs and the Defendants to
11 get through the litigation.

12 And that was in a process where all counsel -- and
13 there were many -- were actually interviewed by a special
14 magistrate for consideration of a leadership structure
15 designed to provide exactly what your Honor asked for, and
16 that is an efficient discovery of the materials in the
17 litigation, plus a system in place that would monitor and
18 manage the time and have timely reports to the Court
19 concerning both expenditures of expenses as well as time
20 spent in the case.

21 Any other questions, your Honor?

22 THE COURT: I have none. Thank you.

23 MR. HAUSFELD: Thank you, your Honor.

24 THE COURT: All right. How about Lowey,
25 Dannenberg and Gold, Bennett.

1 MR. CERA: Good morning, your Honor. Sol Cera
2 from Gold, Bennett.

3 THE COURT: Mr. Cera, I think we should
4 acknowledge to the courtroom that we've seen each other in a
5 prior life.

6 MR. CERA: Yes, your Honor, we have.

7 THE COURT: We have daughters who went to school
8 together a couple of years apart.

9 MR. CERA: Yes. Yes, your Honor.

10 THE COURT: Nice to have you in court.

11 MR. CERA: Thank you. I fondly remember those
12 days. Time is passing quickly.

13 THE COURT: I do mostly.

14 MR. CERA: And your Honor, I think yesterday's
15 events in the game show that us 49er fans know that we
16 played in the real Super Bowl. We lost it, but
17 unfortunately, we couldn't be there yesterday.

18 Your Honor, I'm going to speak just briefly with regard
19 to my clients, the Rockman Company and the M.T. Trading.
20 And I have partnered with the Lowey, Dannenberg firm in
21 connection with the prosecution of the class claims in this
22 case, and we think we have developed an effective team to
23 bring the cases.

24 Rockman is a very substantial buyer of this product.
25 We have indicated to the Court there was \$30 million worth

1 of Korean Ramen noodle product bought by Rockman, a major
2 distributor of the products, over the length of the class
3 period. We also have a large distributor located in the
4 Central United States, M.T. Trading in Texas, who also
5 distributes the product throughout the country.

6 These are significant clients. They're keenly
7 interested in representing the class and effectively
8 prosecuting this case on behalf of the class.

9 We, of course, are mindful of the Court's concerns with
10 regard to costs and attorney's fees. I don't think any of
11 the structure that is proposed here is going to have any
12 impact on the attorney's fees because at the end of the day,
13 no matter how large the case is -- and I think we may have a
14 slightly different view as to some counsel as to the
15 potential size of the case -- we're all going to be in here,
16 if we're successful of course, asking for a percentage fee
17 based on the result we've obtained.

18 And I think all of these firms in this room here that
19 represent Plaintiffs have careful systems in place to keep
20 track and monitor the hours that are spent on the
21 litigation. And certainly with costs, we're very mindful of
22 keeping costs down, but expending what is necessary to
23 effectively prosecuting the case. So it's a balance that
24 you strike. Of course these costs are kept track of very
25 closely, monitored closely by counsel. And we would do that

1 in this case.

2 Your Honor, with regard to the point you made about the
3 fact that there was an initial filing, I would like to point
4 out that -- by Mr. Hausfeld's firm and the Glancy, Binkow
5 firm in the Central District of California, these filings
6 that have been made, at least initially were based on a
7 public order issued by the Korean Fair Trade Commission.

8 Mr. Hausfeld and the Glancy, Binkow firm had their own
9 translation of that order. We spent money also doing a
10 separate careful translation of the order. But the
11 litigation that went on in the Central District of
12 California seems, if you look at the docket there, to be in
13 large part focused on responding to some initial orders that
14 the judge issued and entering into some agreements about
15 extending dates, and then trying very hard to get the case
16 transferred to what has turned out to be the appropriate
17 venue, the Northern District of California and your Honor's
18 courtroom here.

19 So I don't think there's been a great deal of progress
20 that was made in the first filed case. And obviously what's
21 followed is a large number of cases, ours based on our own
22 translation of the order, a unique complaint. We did not
23 copy anybody's complaint. We filed a unique complaint. We
24 carefully researched it.

25 We've got a group of five cases that are supported by

1 obviously my firm, the Lowey, Dannenberg firm, but also by
2 Cohen, Milstein, a nationally prominent anti-trust firm,
3 also by the Cotchett, Pitre firm, who is represented here
4 today, and also by the Joseph Saveri law firm.

5 So we have a group of lawyers that have worked together
6 carefully. We've made strenuous efforts, your Honor, to try
7 and reach an agreement. Unfortunately, they didn't bear
8 fruit. But we believe our group, representing the largest
9 number of cases with careful work done to date, which my
10 colleague Ms. Hart will describe for you, is the appropriate
11 lead counsel in this matter.

12 And I would like to introduce Barbara Hart, your Honor,
13 from the Lowey, Dannenberg firm in New York. Ms. Hart has
14 become a welcome colleague of mine. We have worked well
15 together over the past several months in pursuing this
16 litigation. She is head of the New York State Anti-Trust
17 Bar for 2014. And I am pleased to introduce her to the
18 Court. Thank you, your Honor.

19 MS. HART: Good morning.

20 THE COURT: Good morning.

21 MS. HART: The Court is obligated to determine
22 which firm is going to truly advance the litigation and
23 which firm has demonstrated a commitment to advancing the
24 litigation. And I'm here to say that I believe that what
25 we've proposed as the structure really should win it on the

1 merits.

2 We tried to do a collation of all the firms. I
3 repeatedly tried to say that we were advancing the analysis
4 and that we had moved off of the KFTC order in the work that
5 we had done. And I tried to share that collaboratively with
6 all the firms in order to discuss the substance of where our
7 thinking is.

8 And part of the reason that we did that is because of
9 the tremendous political pressure that the KFTC is under in
10 Korea due to the class actions in the U.S. The KFTC order
11 speaks to a very long collaboration, conspiracy between the
12 Korean companies. That has created a -- I don't know what
13 the legal term for blow-back is, but a lot of press in Korea
14 surrounding almost a sense of disloyalty of the government
15 against its own companies, once the domestic U.S. -- once
16 the U.S. litigation was initiated. There's significant
17 press surrounding this issue.

18 We were very aware of that. We too, like my colleague,
19 Sung-Min Lee, is a dual thinker in Korean and English
20 because of his life story. He was reading all of the press
21 and reading much of the materials in Korean newspapers,
22 Korean databases.

23 Through that work, I was like, Sung, we're just going
24 to focus. We're going to focus forward. The KFTC order
25 gets us to impact in Korea. It gets us to impact in Korea.

1 We are now charged with proving this case's impact in the
2 U.S. DOJ is not here. This isn't a lay-up on impact in the
3 U.S. It's possibly a very compelling case already on the
4 record of a fact of a conspiracy at these Ramen gatherings
5 and discussions.

6 That goes this far. We've got to focus over here. So
7 to that end, Sung and I, back and forth, back and forth. He
8 ends up coming up with this vast database where the Korean
9 government requires the Korean companies to report their
10 pricing and break it out on what is there called domestic,
11 meaning in Korea -- domestic pricing and export pricing.

12 None of the other firms came up with that database.
13 That was the database that our firm worked with our
14 economist with. And I can tell you, we haven't sunk
15 \$100,000 in costs. If you're concerned about costs, there's
16 not really a lot of there there, but there's \$100,000
17 already out the door. So that's a little bit concerning.

18 But so we worked with this wealth of data that exists.
19 And you'll see this in the complaints that we filed. And we
20 did some highlighting on some of the facts that we found.
21 We also, because we were very focused, we found admissions
22 by the American subsidiaries of the Korean companies about
23 the fact that there's a lag between the Korean pricing and
24 then the adoption of that same conspiratorily alleged
25 inflation in price.

1 There's a time lag, but then boom, it arrives in the
2 U.S. And we have both class members quoted in various
3 publications in Korean that were translated as saying that
4 the wholesale food distributors received this impact, and we
5 have actors, the market participants, the domestic American
6 subsidiaries making admissions against interest.

7 And we didn't set forth all of them in our moving
8 papers, but we set forth a couple of really good ones that
9 speak to what will be where the rubber meets the road in
10 this litigation, which is not a done deal based on the KFTC
11 order. You can't rest on the laurels of what the KFTC did.
12 And this is acutely the case because when the KFTC
13 government came under pressure, there was press about this.

14 And your Honor, one of the key issues that I need to
15 speak to today, which is slightly unpleasant, and I don't
16 want -- I have to bring this to the Court's attention
17 because it could be to the detriment of the class, and it
18 could be seen as opportunism on my part. And I -- you'll
19 have to assess that for yourself. But I have an obligation.
20 Motions to disqualify are required to be brought promptly.

21 And I did my homework on that, and there's a
22 countervailing concern that they'll be seen as
23 opportunistic. And so do this with due caution that I bring
24 this to the Court's attention, but it would come back to the
25 detriment of the class potentially down the road at class

1 certification.

2 So if I may, I'm going to ask Sung to distribute, and
3 I'm going to hand to the court reporter, if I may,
4 something. And this just came to the attention of us
5 because it was disclosed for the first time -- if you could
6 give this out -- in the moving papers that the Glancy and
7 Hausfeld firms had affiliated with DR Aju, the Korean law
8 firm that they are touting as working with the Korean
9 government.

10 And in working with the Korean government, DR Aju,
11 brought a credibility to their application. And I
12 understand why they would want to employ the affiliation.
13 They originally had Korean law firm, We The People law firm,
14 and then they had DR Aju that is just first on their papers.
15 So this is the first time I'm able to speak to this.

16 So I anticipate that they'll want to respond, but this
17 is the first time I can speak to this because of the
18 agreement among counsel that we would stand on single
19 submissions. So I think this is the proper time.

20 So the first article is Korean press giving the KFTC a
21 hard time, a hard time about the fact that they were
22 subjecting Korean companies to litigation in the U.S. I
23 mean, I might sound inappropriate, but I think it's a tight-
24 knit Korean world, you know. And culturally, tight-knit.
25 And so there's a disloyalty, and the government is getting

1 this hard time.

2 The government -- the second piece of paper that I've
3 handed you is the KFTC's website responding to the negative
4 press. And it's posted on the KFTC website. And for the
5 convenience of the Court, because Sung -- you know, we're
6 working so closely on this. We're really focused. How do
7 we bring value. We're focused, focused on how do we prove
8 U.S. impact, and where does the KFTC order get us, and what
9 does that accomplish, and where does it stop and start.

10 And this comes up because every company in Korea except
11 for Sam Yang took it up on appeal. They objected to the
12 findings, and then just in November of 2013, the Korean
13 Appellate Court enforced the order of the KFTC. So it goes
14 up -- it's a different language for what this is called, but
15 there was like an objection to the KFTC finding and the
16 fines, and they take it up on appeal, and the Korean courts
17 uphold the verdict.

18 And this is very controversial. And there's press
19 surrounding this and press surrounding the U.S. litigation.
20 The KFTC is defending itself on its website in response to
21 the press. And this is an English language translation of
22 what's on the press.

23 The KFTC, which DR Aju, the co-counsel in this
24 litigation, says specifically in response to the criticism
25 that they're subjecting us to the U.S. -- subjecting the

1 companies to U.S. litigation -- if you'll look at the last
2 two bullets on this, this is their determinations. This is
3 the KFTC's determination with their counsel, DR Aju, which
4 is now affiliated with the other proposed lead counsel.

5 "We determined" -- this is the government -- the Korean
6 government's definitive position. "We determined that
7 exported products were not subject to price fixing and did
8 not include in the calculation of relevant sales figures."

9 The latter part of that, what they're saying is, we
10 penalize the government -- the companies -- forgive me. And
11 when we calculated the amount of the penalty, we didn't
12 calculate it based on export prices because we didn't -- we
13 found expressly our finding is it didn't have an impact in
14 what is the crux of our case. Our obligation for our class
15 is that it impacted us over here.

16 The KFTC has taken a position antithetical to that.
17 And then they go on, "It is unreasonable to argue that the
18 injunction of price fixing which hurts the domestic market,"
19 to which they're alluding the Korean domestic market -- "is
20 the basis for lawsuits against our Korean companies,"
21 speaking to the loyalty that's felt.

22 So I don't think we need to reach a motion to
23 disqualify. It wasn't briefed. They should be heard.
24 Perhaps there was a waiver. I don't think you can get an
25 absent class member waiver. So that's a problem. It's a

1 burden that the class isn't required to take on that they're
2 affiliated -- DR Aju on its website, there are handshakes,
3 pictures, photographs. They are counsel to the KFTC.

4 What Mr. Hausfeld represented is quite correct. They
5 have a very vast, vast contract as consultants to the KFTC.
6 I don't know that there was a waiver. I don't know anything
7 about how it came to be that they're now co-counsel in U.S.
8 litigation. Was that vetted? Has that been vetted?

9 The weirdest part is that We The People, okay, in
10 November 2013, there's press -- Sung, did you have copies of
11 that one too?

12 There's press where We The People, their original Korea
13 co-counsel is saying, we believe that there was domestic
14 impact. DR Aju is identified -- this is in Korean Daily.
15 I'm sorry, your Honor. Some of this we just were able to do
16 research on over the last couple of days because of the
17 submission dates.

18 So what publication is this, please?

19 So We The People is identified as counsel in the U.S.,
20 and DR Aju is identified as counsel to the KFTC. And they,
21 in this one article, are taking different adverse positions
22 about the U.S. litigation.

23 And what I want to kind of say as diplomatically as I
24 can is, the fact that this wasn't vetted or discussed -- or
25 maybe it was, and you'll hear from them. Maybe there's a

1 perfectly good answer, and that's for them to provide. It
2 certainly wasn't addressed in the papers. DR Aju is brought
3 forward as another feather in their cap of credibility,
4 right? That's credibility. It's going to be about the
5 Korean proceedings. No, it's not. We've got our own
6 burden. We have to do this. The Korean government says,
7 hey, we're not --

8 THE COURT: I think I have your point there.

9 MS. HART: Yeah. So like why didn't Hausfeld's
10 firm and Glancy, Binkow drill down? Because I don't think
11 they're focused. I think they've got -- they're not really
12 focused on this. I assure you, we're really focused on
13 this. We will advance this efficiently. We know how to run
14 complex litigation. I think we've demonstrated we're here
15 to prove this case. And that's our job for this class.

16 What's the publication, Sung?

17 MR. LEE: Good morning, your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Good morning. If you would introduce
19 yourself for the record.

20 MR. LEE: Absolutely. My name is Sung-Min Lee
21 with Lowey, Dannenberg for Plaintiff, Pitco.

22 The article that I'm looking at right now is written in
23 Korean. The title is "News This." And it talks about the
24 impact on the Ramen industry in South Korea.

25 I can explain the two consecutive paragraphs in this

1 one article. The first paragraph talks about We The People
2 firm, which is one of the firms associated with the Hausfeld
3 firm on behalf of The Plaza Company. And We The People
4 states that this litigation in the U.S. is ongoing and also
5 explains the treble damages.

6 In the following paragraph, there are two statements by
7 two entities. First is Defendant Nong Shim, and the second
8 is the KFTC. Nong Shim states that because the products
9 sold in the U.S. are manufactured in the U.S., the pricing
10 structure and distribution is different. Therefore, this is
11 irrelevant to the KFTC decision.

12 And in the next sentence, the KFTC states that the
13 domestic imposition of fines is irrelevant to the business
14 overseas. This is all in response to the recent actions
15 brought by Nong Shim, Ottogi and Korea Yakult against --
16 against the KFTC in order to vacate the penalties. So
17 that's what this document is.

18 THE COURT: Thank you very much.

19 MS. HART: So as I say, your Honor, I think we've
20 demonstrated that we're focused on what will need to be the
21 advancement of the litigation. The analysis of the pricing
22 impact in the U.S., the analysis of the intent to impact
23 prices in the U.S. and the proof of price impact in the U.S.
24 And I'm happy to answer any questions that you have.

25 THE COURT: That's fine. Thank you very much.

1 MS. HART: Thank you.

2 THE COURT: Let's go -- before I go back to the
3 Hausfeld firm, let's go to Freed Kanner. Take your time.

4 MR. KANNER: Your Honor, we seem to have gone a
5 bit far afield of your original request for what you'd like
6 us to include in our presentations. And I'll be mindful of
7 that.

8 I would like to present the firm of Freed, Kanner,
9 London & Millen -- my name is Steve Kanner -- as a logical,
10 rational, reasonable, good choice as one of the co-lead
11 counsel in this case.

12 There's been some discussion of firms that have
13 databases of pricing. Candidly, Judge, we're representing
14 three major clients, as you identified earlier. Any firm
15 that undertakes the representation of clients of that
16 stature and size ought to be creating from the get-go a
17 database of their clients' purchases and correlate those
18 with the Korean prices.

19 Do we include that in the pleadings? No. There are a
20 lot of things one doesn't include in initial pleadings
21 because, frankly, we're dealing with the initial complaint,
22 which we all know in a matter based on your Honor's
23 decision, 90 days, 60 days, will be a consolidated amended
24 complaint, which ought to bear some of the fruit of those
25 investigations and of the databases. That's number one.

1 Your Honor talked about Korean contacts and how those
2 play into this. I was with Mr. Hausfeld years ago when we
3 opened up Korea in terms of coordinating with these types of
4 cases and, in fact, have been working with those firms since
5 even before then as the Freed, Kanner firm represented two
6 major Korean companies. Forgive me. It's Kohap Chemical
7 Company. If I just say Southern Korea, I'll have to go with
8 that. I believe it's Busan. And the other is Inhee
9 Lighting Company, which is a lot closer.

10 So we represented each of those cases in different U.S.
11 Anti-Trust cases. It's really opened up an entire new area
12 of companies that needed representation in the U.S. because
13 they purchased in the United States. We have been working
14 with the counsel at the -- at the Wan (phonetic) firm for
15 over a decade. In fact, we helped to host one of their
16 primary attorneys, one of my contemporaries, Yung Ho Sun
17 (phonetic), who obtained his joint legal degree after his
18 Korean law degree at the University of Illinois. We've been
19 working with them on a consistent basis. They have
20 investigators. They are our primary contacts over there,
21 and we work very successfully with them.

22 Your Honor also asked about how do we avoid duplication
23 and running the time, as it were. That's a subject near and
24 dear to my heart, and frankly, it's a subject near and dear
25 to most judge's hearts. And I'd like to give you two

1 examples of how we've addressed that in the recent past.

2 Our firm was one of the co-lead counsel in the Air and
3 Oil Filter Anti-Trust litigation that was before Judge
4 Gettleman in the Northern District. And we're a Chicago
5 firm, and from the beginning of the case, the judge
6 admonished us, and, in fact, we had an in-chambers hearing
7 with how we were going to approach that very issue.

8 And I can tell you what the result was as opposed to
9 what happened at the hearing. The result was, we created a
10 time and expense chart that each firm involved in the case
11 was required to submit on a monthly basis. If they failed
12 to do so within the time period, they understood that that
13 time was not going to be submitted to the court for
14 compensation. That was the first layer.

15 The second layer is, we had to represent to the court
16 that we would make sure that those firms only did assigned
17 work and did not go off on their own issues. We've done
18 that. At the end of the case, Judge Gettleman was
19 complimentary of the manner in which we accomplished that
20 task.

21 That similar process was an issue raised by Judge
22 Batani (phonetic) a year and a half ago when we began the
23 Auto Products Anti-Trust litigation which was the result of
24 a massive U.S. Attorney investigation into the -- you name
25 it -- part of the automobile.

1 Now, I'm one of the co-lead counsel for the direct
 2 purchaser class. We have seven cases within the direct
 3 purchaser group thus far. Ultimately, Judge Batani was
 4 concerned with time and expenses and fees, and we produced
 5 to her quarterly reports of all time and expenses. And thus
 6 far, she's satisfied with the production. And we continued
 7 that as every new case was reached.

8 I'd like to talk for a moment about the AFTA, the Asian
 9 Food Trade Association. It's not just a trade organization.
 10 The two largest groups -- and it really falls along ethnic
 11 lines -- of Korean Ramen noodles is the Asian community and,
 12 believe it or not, the fastest growing group is the Hispanic
 13 community in terms of consumption of these products. And I
 14 think both our clients and the AFTA addressed those issues.

15 AFTA, for the last 30 years, has represented more than
 16 200 members of its organization. They market to 1500
 17 supermarkets across the country, and 40 to 50 of those
 18 members are major purchasers of Korean Ramen noodles.
 19 Cooperation of the president of AFTA and through the
 20 president, its members, has resulted in our being named
 21 special counsel.

22 Now, why special counsel? There's a real concern
 23 within various segments of the community that talking to the
 24 lawyers prosecuting the case could lead to those
 25 conversations being publicized, which could lead to

1 potential retaliation.

2 The AFTA is very aware of this. It's not unusual
3 within certain groups to be concerned about that. We've
4 addressed that issue, and they've addressed that issue by
5 asking us to act as special counsel.

6 In the course of our work with the AFTA and since being
7 named special counsel, we've talked to more than two dozen
8 companies and individuals who have knowledge of what's going
9 on over the last eight years with the Korean -- the Korean
10 Ramen noodle conspiracy. We plan to make use of that in the
11 amended complaint, and it's part of the prosecution of the
12 case.

13 That logically leads to who it is that we represent.
14 I'm actually proud to say that in connection with AFTA, we
15 represent Summit. Summit is one of the largest purchasers
16 of Korean Ramen noodle products in the United States. And
17 it's worth a side note that Summit is, of course, an Asian
18 company. It was formed by a Chinese immigrant to this
19 country who had a professional degree in the 1960s and
20 couldn't get hired. So he created Summit.

21 Summit went from being a ma and pa organization to
22 having hundreds of employees. They're one of the largest
23 fillers in the U.S. They sell 3,000 products to wholesalers
24 and literally sell through the United States and to foreign
25 countries.

1 The second and third companies we represent are in the
2 Hispanic community. El Jarocho has been in business for 25
3 years. They started as a ma and pa, if I use that term
4 again, organization in Chicago, not far from our offices.
5 They've since moved from this ma and pa organization to a
6 company that employs scores of individuals. They sell to
7 seven states in the Southeast and sell to 3,000 wholesalers.
8 They're a significant company.

9 And then finally Diaz. I'm particularly proud of Diaz
10 as a client. Long discussions with them. They've decided
11 to carry the flag on behalf of, in their minds, not just the
12 Hispanic users, but all users of these products and all
13 purchasers.

14 They've grown from a small company to over 200
15 employees, serving 5,000 customers in 25 states. They've
16 also -- they're also proud to have been named among the top
17 500 Hispanic owned businesses in the country.

18 This case is more than just about a store acting as the
19 client's representative. It's about serious purchasers,
20 people who are at risk, who believe they're truly at risk
21 for stepping forward. In my practice for 35 years, I take a
22 somewhat serious approach to that, and our practice, as your
23 Honor saw from the pleadings, reflects that. We've had a
24 lot of good successes. And I truly believe that these
25 communities deserve to be represented in these cases. I am

1 humbled by the fact that these companies have sought our
2 firm to be a lead counsel.

3 I want to add one or two more facts. Number one, I've
4 worked -- and I think under 23(g), one of the issues to be
5 concerned is whether the firms over here are not just
6 competent, have the commitment, have the funding -- I think
7 we all have that, as your Honor noted. But one of the
8 factors is how well we work with other firms.

9 I'm also pleased to say that I've worked with Mr.
10 Cera's firm. I've run cases with him. We're currently
11 involved in cases together quite successfully. And I'm also
12 very proud to say that one of my mentors in this practice,
13 Mr. Hausfeld, we have been co-lead counsel in more than six
14 cases over the years, and I continue to work cases with him.

15 I'm a little sensitive to some of the remarks that were
16 made earlier. I'm not carrying anyone's water, but I do
17 take some issue with the tone and the nature of those
18 suggestions. It all brings to the point of firms that work
19 with each other well and can coordinate.

20 I believe, your Honor, we've coalesced into three
21 groups over here. Mr. Cera and Ms. Hart filed a joint
22 petition. Mr. Hausfeld and Mr. Glancy filed a joint
23 petition. Each of those sought to name two of their
24 members. The Freed, Kanner group as it were consists of
25 four law firms, the Specter, Roseman firm, the Heins, Mills,

1 Olson firm, and I'm privileged to have Rick Saveri, Guido's
2 son. I've worked with Guido for my entire career as my
3 senior partner, and I've run cases with Rick all
4 successfully.

5 I submit to your Court that there is a logical way to
6 approach this. It's a case -- we don't know the size of the
7 case. I can say -- and I wanted to remember to add this --
8 that during the affected time period -- and we're all
9 talking about the same period -- the product sales into the
10 United States were between 500 and \$650 million.

11 I'm not in the business of calling it a small case or a
12 large case. I am in the business of prosecuting these cases
13 and getting the best results for my clients and for the
14 class. So we've naturally coalesced into three groups, one
15 at each table and then the Freed, Kanner group. And I
16 suggest, your Honor, there is a logical approach, and that
17 is to select one from each group to prosecute this case.

18 And I certainly commit to your Honor to doing so in a
19 way which fully incorporates all the firms, the clients and
20 pools our research and work product together. Thank you,
21 your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kanner.

23 So Mr. Hausfeld, I don't know whether you want to
24 respond to the conflict allegations that were made earlier
25 or whether you want to brief them. I'm a little bemused by

1 the whole topic at this point.

2 MR. HAUSFELD: So am I, your Honor. And I
3 think -- well, I thought that Groundhog Day was yesterday,
4 but apparently some of my colleagues wish to relive this
5 under the Joe McCarthy era. I think it's simple to say that
6 the Drescher firm is not the Korean Trade Commission. Their
7 name doesn't appear on those representations.

8 What the Drescher firm has is an ability of any counsel
9 here, is a complete understanding of the evidence that was
10 presented in Korea concerning the practices and an ability
11 to translate that evidence to what happened in the United
12 States.

13 With respect to the amount of expenditure, we were
14 within four days of having to file by order of the Court a
15 motion for class certification. It was necessary to provide
16 an economic report, for which we would have been remiss in
17 our representation if we did not do an analysis economically
18 of how the practices in Korea may have mirrored the
19 consequences and effects of pricing of Ramen noodles in the
20 United States. So we too had done that, would have done
21 that on an accelerated basis, based on the Court's
22 scheduling.

23 To state the obvious -- I don't want to say I'm the
24 oldest person necessarily on the Plaintiff's side, but let's
25 say the most senior. We've been doing this for over four

1 and a half decades myself. We've been selected in more
2 anti-trust cases to lead those cases for a reason over those
3 four and a half decades. It's not only that we've taken
4 more of those cases to trial, that we've settled more of
5 those cases, but that we've also effectively adjusted the
6 practice to account for not only the presence of direct
7 purchaser plaintiffs, but indirect purchaser plaintiffs, as
8 well as opt-outs.

9 And we have a rich and long history in managing all of
10 those three that could be disparate elements and succeeding
11 in exiting the litigation successfully and responsibly on
12 the part of not just the direct claimant's class, but the
13 entire litigation.

14 The selection of counsel really rests in the discretion
15 of the Court in terms of the presentations of the
16 qualifications, the history and the reputation and character
17 of counsel, one in which the Court has to be the one that's
18 comfortable with the selection it makes.

19 I think the presentation today has given you a good
20 example or illustration of the character of the counsel and
21 the dedication and commitment and history of what they have
22 to bring.

23 THE COURT: So enough, as you stand here, to
24 represent to the Court that there's not a concern about the
25 counsel in Korea that could lead to a successful

1 disqualification motion?

2 MR. HAUSFELD: Not only would I give that
3 confirmation to the Court without revealing any other
4 information based on our conversations and dealings with
5 Drescher, I think that there is significant benefit and
6 information that they would bring that would assist in the
7 successful prosecution on behalf of the direct Plaintiffs
8 that any counsel would be remiss in not accepting on behalf
9 of that class.

10 THE COURT: Thank you.

11 All right. Well, you've all given me plenty to think
12 of. Is somebody standing up? You want to come forward
13 and -- step up to the microphone and introduce yourself.

14 MR. SANDERS: Joel Sanders of Gibson, Dunn
15 representing the Defendant Ottogi America.

16 THE COURT: Mr. Sanders.

17 MR. SANDERS: And if I could just take two minutes
18 to talk a little bit about the structure of Plaintiff's
19 counsel. Because it's something that I am concerned about.

20 I am not going to say anything about who among all
21 these lawyers ought to be appointed lead counsel. I know
22 many of them. I know this group includes some of the best
23 anti-trust lawyers in the country. I am confident that from
24 within this group, the class can find excellent
25 representation.

1 I am concerned about the structure because the
2 structure of the Plaintiff's counsel, if it's not done
3 correctly, inevitably leads to inefficiencies, which drives
4 up the cost of the Defendants, which is our concern.

5 And what I'm going to suggest is that this is a case
6 that warrants a single firm on the Plaintiff's side taking
7 control of the litigation for the direct purchasers. Let's
8 keep in mind there's another group of cases that will be
9 litigated with this. Discovery will be consolidated. The
10 indirect purchasers, they'll have their own counsel.

11 But I am concerned that people here are talking about
12 leadership structures with two, three or four different law
13 firms running them. Those are structures that we have seen
14 in a number of cases. In this district, for example, we've
15 seen it in the LCD case, the CRT case, the D-RAM case and
16 many others. Those are much bigger cases.

17 Those are cases where the volume of commerce at issue,
18 the affected commerce, was typically somewhere between 10
19 billion and \$100 billion. Those are cases where there were
20 at least 10 defendant families in each case. And big
21 companies. We're talking Samsung, LG, Toshiba, Hitachi,
22 names that everyone is familiar with.

23 If you accept what's in the complaint and what counsel
24 has said, I think we'll find that the volume of commerce at
25 issue here is less than \$1 billion. We're talking less than

1 10-percent of any of those cases. We're talking about four
2 defendant families. These are not big companies. These are
3 four makers of Korean noodles that I suspect almost no one
4 on the Defense side had ever heard of before this case was
5 filed.

6 Compared to some of these other cases that have
7 leadership structures with multiple law firms and maybe
8 warrant multiple law firms, this is, in fact, a small case.
9 So my plea, my argument, my request is that whatever you
10 decide, whatever firm you decide to choose to lead this,
11 that for the sake of efficiency, that you make it a single
12 law firm on the Plaintiff's side for the direct purchaser in
13 charge of representing the class. Thank you.

14 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Sanders.

15 MR. SAVERI: Your Honor, may I be heard?

16 THE COURT: Please.

17 MR. SAVERI: Your Honor, Rick Saveri on behalf of
18 Summit, Jarocho and Diaz.

19 Well, I've heard it all. Mr. Sanders has talked about
20 a few of the electronic cases that I am also co-lead on the
21 Plaintiff's side in there. And I'd like to put in a few
22 kind words for a billion dollars, being a small case, your
23 Honor. I've never heard that before.

24 This is a very good sized case and a big case. Whether
25 it's a billion, 2 billion, 3 billion, 4 billion, it's a big

1 case, your Honor, and there's a lot of lawyers with a lot of
2 clients that have come before you.

3 And I want to just take one minute to make two quick
4 points, your Honor. One is is that, as Mr. Kanner has said,
5 we had three complaints with a group of lawyers that were on
6 those complaints. There were four law firms, all very
7 qualified, all of -- who have all been appointed by federal
8 judges, not only in this district, but across the country,
9 to lead anti-trust cases.

10 All of us have stepped down and selected one from our
11 group, the Freed, Kanner firm out of Chicago to be our
12 representative for our group to be a lead counsel here. And
13 that's really what it's broken down to, to the three groups.

14 So as far as our group, we have selected one, sponsored
15 him. And we've all worked with all of these counsel here.
16 My firm has worked with Mr. Cera in the Methionine
17 litigation. We were co-lead counsel. Three. Judge Briar
18 picked three in Methionine.

19 In D-RAM, you heard the reference by Mr. Sanders, Judge
20 Hamilton picked three. And just recently, Judge Rogers in
21 the Lithium Ion Battery litigation, which I was selected as
22 one of the co-lead counsel. Why do we need three? So we
23 went into the three and this very issue of why three was a
24 good number to go forward with the litigation.

25 And some of the reasons for that, your Honor, is we're

1 not just dealing with Mr. Sanders, just one defense counsel
2 over there. You're going to see a group of defense counsel
3 coming in here.

4 So it's very nice that the defense counsel want to
5 limit the plaintiff counsel that are available for the
6 plaintiff class, but then have multiple counsel on their
7 side that we have to deal with. And so what happens is,
8 when you have a group of two or three -- and three is a
9 very, very good number. It's not too big and it's not too
10 small, so that you can deal with this counsel and that
11 counsel. Well, I'll pick up this guy from this defense firm
12 to handle the issues as they come. So that -- it becomes an
13 efficient way to move these litigations forward.

14 What there's a tendency is is that if you have one,
15 then it just gets farmed out, your Honor. Where as when you
16 have three, you will be able to have a group that can handle
17 it and efficiently manage it. And that's what Judge Rogers
18 decided just recently in the Lithium Ion Battery litigation.
19 It was three with a liaison, and it's worked excellently.
20 Thank you very much.

21 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Saveri.

22 All right. Nobody else is standing up, so I'm about
23 to. Thank you all for your presentations, and I'll try and
24 get an order out hopefully today.

25 ALL: Thank you, your Honor.

1 (Proceedings adjourned at 9:55 a.m.)
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

3 I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct
4 transcript, to the best of my ability, of the above pages of
5 the official electronic sound recording provided to me by
6 the U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, of
7 the proceedings taken on the date and time previously stated
8 in the above matter.

9 I further certify that I am neither counsel for,
10 related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action
11 in which this hearing was taken; and, further, that I am not
12 financially nor otherwise interested in the outcome of the
13 action.

14 | Taaqyeen

16 | Echo Reporting, Inc., Transcriber

17 Wednesday, February 5, 2014